

EXHIBIT E

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR ERIC GRIFFIN					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	9	15	9	17
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	9	20	9	25
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	10	23	11	1
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	21	15	22	8
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	22	13	23	11
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	24	25	25	8
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	25	18	26	24
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	35	2	36	5
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	36	14	37	5
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	37	11	38	3
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	38	10	38	14
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	38	18	38	23
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	39	10	39	14
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	40	18	41	5
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	42	10	42	25
1/23/2019	Janssen Affirm	43	1	43	24
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	43	25	44	22
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	44	24	45	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	45	15	45	16
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	45	21	45	25
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	46	2	46	11
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	47	1	47	12
1/23/2019	Janssen Affirm	47	23	47	25
1/23/2019	Janssen Affirm	48	1	48	25
1/23/2019	Janssen Affirm	49	1	49	25
1/23/2019	Janssen Affirm	50	1	50	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	50	25	51	10
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	52	3	52	15
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	52	16	52	23
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	57	15	58	15
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	58	16	59	20
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	62	15	63	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	63	13	64	5
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	64	12	64	16
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	68	9	68	22
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	69	17	70	3
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	70	7	70	13
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	70	14	74	17
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	76	1	76	18
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	78	22	79	21
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	79	25	80	14
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	81	7	81	23
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	82	13	83	6
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	83	17	83	20
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	89	11	89	21
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	90	14	91	4
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	91	13	91	21
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	98	16	99	1
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	100	13	102	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	108	25	109	6
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	111	17	113	1
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	115	12	115	22
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	116	11	117	22

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR ERIC GRIFFIN					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	124	10	125	16
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	125	17	125	23
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	126	8	126	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	126	24	130	15
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	132	10	133	21
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	133	22	133	25
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	136	16	136	21
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	136	22	137	14
1/23/2019	Dist & Pharm Affirm	140	8	142	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	143	14	143	21
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	143	22	143	22
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	146	18	149	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	149	10	149	19
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	153	4	154	17
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	154	18	158	11
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	158	12	161	3
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	161	4	163	14
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	164	4	164	16
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	177	23	179	25
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	180	1	180	5
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	180	25	181	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	181	10	182	15
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	183	19	184	4
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	186	14	186	23
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	187	3	187	6
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	190	10	190	20
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	191	4	191	13
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	191	20	191	24
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	192	16	193	14
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	195	15	196	12
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	203	14	204	6
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	205	18	206	19
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	207	18	208	2
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	211	1	211	11
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	213	7	214	15
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	224	9	224	16
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	224	21	225	1
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	226	4	226	12
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	226	13	227	8
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	228	4	228	11
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	229	3	229	7
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	230	6	230	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	237	7	239	6
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	239	7	240	2
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	240	13	241	19
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	246	19	247	7
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	247	20	249	4
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	249	10	249	13
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	250	6	250	9
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	251	4	251	21
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	252	23	258	19
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	259	12	259	18
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	261	11	261	16

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR ERIC GRIFFIN					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	261	17	262	19
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	263	21	264	13
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	264	21	265	8
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	266	21	267	18
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	267	19	268	19
1/23/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	269	4	269	21
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	270	18	271	24
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	279	16	280	15
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	281	7	283	9
1/23/2019	Pharm Affirm	285	25	290	25
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	292	15	293	2
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	295	17	295	25
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	298	14	298	18
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	298	25	299	7
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	299	18	299	22
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	299	23	300	3
1/23/2019	All Def Affirm	300	19	301	6

PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS				
Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	Plaintiffs' Objection
42	19	42	25	foundation; misstates prior testimony
44	10	44	22	calls for legal conclusion; speculation; foundation
52	3	52	23	relevance
57	15	58	15	relevance; vague
115	12	115	22	relevance
116	11	116	24	relevance
116	25	117	9	hearsay; relevance
117	10	117	22	relevance
125	17	125	20	hearsay; relevance
141	16	141	23	hearsay
154	18	158	5	hearsay; relevance; foundation
158	12	160	19	hearsay; relevance; foundation
160	20	161	3	relevance
161	4	163	14	hearsay; relevance; foundation
164	4	164	16	relevance
211	1	211	11	speculation; foundation
226	4	227	1	hearsay
263	21	264	9	speculation; foundation
267	5	267	12	calls for legal conclusion
267	13	267	18	vague
279	16	280	15	relevance; speculation; foundation

RESPONSES FOR ERIC GRIFFIN					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	NOTES
1/23/2019	42	19	42	25	Response: The question does not misstate prior testimony. The witness testified the board came to realize that there was an opioid crisis before he became a board member in 2008 when he joined. The response does not lack foundation because the question asks for the witness's personal understanding of the board's awareness of an opioid crisis.
1/23/2019	44	10	44	22	Response: The question does not call for a legal conclusion or call for the witness to speculate. The question asks for the witness's understanding of diversion based on his experience and as a member of the Board of Pharmacy. The testimony does not lack foundation as the questions ask for the witness's personal understanding of diversion, which he developed during his career and experience on the Board.
1/23/2019	52	3	52	23	Response: Testimony is relevant to witness's experience with opioid- and drug-related crimes and time period during which he first noticed the relationship. Testimony goes to causation and statute of limitations.
1/23/2019	57	15	58	15	Response: Testimony is relevant to the prevalence of prescription pills, heroin and other drugs available during the 2002-2005 time period, which Plaintiffs have deemed to be the relevant time period. Testimony goes to causation and statute of limitations. Questions are clear and unambiguous.
1/23/2019	115	12	115	22	Response: The article and related testimony is relevant in that it describes the former Board of Pharmacy executive director's efforts, or lack thereof, to combat pill mills during a period of time relevant to this litigation. Testimony goes to causation and mitigation of damages.
1/23/2019	116	11	116	24	Response: The article and related testimony is relevant in that it describes the former Board of Pharmacy executive director's efforts, or lack thereof, to combat pill mills during a period of time relevant to this litigation. Testimony goes to causation and mitigation of damages.
1/23/2019	116	25	117	9	Response: The article and related testimony is relevant in that it describes the former Board of Pharmacy executive director's efforts, or lack thereof, to combat pill mills during a period of time relevant to this litigation. Testimony goes to causation and mitigation of damages. The article is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted and/or it falls within the exception for public records.
1/23/2019	117	10	117	22	Response: The article and related testimony is relevant in that it describes the former Board of Pharmacy executive director's efforts, or lack thereof, to combat pill mills during a period of time relevant to this litigation. Testimony goes to causation and mitigation of damages.
1/23/2019	125	17	125	20	Response: The article and related testimony is relevant in that it describes the former Board of Pharmacy executive director's efforts, or lack thereof, to combat pill mills during a period of time relevant to this litigation. The article is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted and/or it falls within the exception for public records.
1/23/2019	141	16	141	23	Response: The article is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted and/or it falls within the exception for public records.

1/23/2019	154	18	158	5	Response: The Board of Pharmacy Order and related testimony is relevant to show instances of diversion of opioids occurring as early as 1996 and 1997, and that the Ohio Board of Pharmacy was aware of these instances and was conducting investigations. Further, the testimony does not lack foundation because the witness previously testified he is involved with the Board of Pharmacy's compliance, enforcement and licensing obligations and processes. The document is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted and/or it falls within the exception for public records.
1/23/2019	158	12	160	19	Response: The settlement agreement and related testimony is relevant to show instances of diversion of opioids occurring as early as 1978 and 1979, and that the Ohio Board of Pharmacy was aware of these instances and was conducting investigations. Further, the testimony does not lack foundation because the witness previously testified he is involved with the Board of Pharmacy's compliance, enforcement and licensing obligations and processes. The document is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted and/or it falls within the exception for public records.
1/23/2019	160	20	161	3	Response: The board's processes for monitoring prescription and dispensing habits in the state in the 1970s are relevant for purposes of comparison to the processes currently in place, including the use of OARRS. Testimony goes to causation and mitigation of damages.
1/23/2019	161	4	163	14	Response: The Board of Pharmacy Order and related testimony is relevant to show instances of diversion of opioids occurring as early as 1981 to 1983, and that the Ohio Board of Pharmacy was aware of these instances and was conducting investigations. Further, the testimony does not lack foundation because the witness previously testified he is involved with the Board of Pharmacy's compliance, enforcement and licensing obligations and processes. The document is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted and/or it falls within the exception for public records.
1/23/2019	164	4	164	16	Response: The Order of the State Board of Pharmacy and related testimony is relevant to show instances of diversion of opioids occurring as early as 1981 to 1983, and that the Ohio Board of Pharmacy was aware of these instances and was conducting investigations.
1/23/2019	211	1	211	11	Response: Question asks for witness's understanding of OARRS based upon his experience and personal knowledge. Question does not ask witness to speculate, but use his experience and personal knowledge to address scenario presented.
1/23/2019	226	4	227	1	Response: Not hearsay, because statement not going to truth of whether there was actually an epidemic, but the point in time at which Ohio began to identify or acknowledge an epidemic.
1/23/2019	263	21	264	9	Response: Does not lack foundation and not speculative because asks question within scope of personal knowledge and experience of witness. Foundation laid for witness's knowledge and experience in preceding testimony.
1/23/2019	267	5	267	12	Response: Does not call for legal conclusion. Asks for understanding of who can determine whether a prescription is for a legitimate medical purpose, not an interpretation of the law.
1/23/2019	267	13	267	18	Response: Question is not vague; clear follow-up to prior question regarding entities/individuals who can determine whether a prescription is for a legitimate medical purpose.

1/23/2019	279	16	280	15	Response: Question does not ask witness to speculate; asks for information within scope of personal knowledge and based on witness's experience as member of Board of Pharmacy. Questioning is relevant to causation and mitigation of damages.
-----------	-----	----	-----	----	---